

Church Union News and Views

Organ of the Continuation Committee
of the
South India Joint Committee on Union

Vol. I

MARCH 1931

No. 5

CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. EDITORIAL	
COUNCIL AND SYNOD RESOLUTIONS	171
MADURA CHURCH COUNCIL	171
WESLEYAN PROVINCIAL SYNOD	172
TRAVANCORE AND CANARESE COUNCIL	172
GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCH OF INDIA, BURMA AND CEYLON	173
LABORATORY OR MUSEUM	174
2. ARTICLES	
NEED FOR RETREATS	175
MADURA CHURCH COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS	182
WESLEYAN METHODIST CHURCH RESOLUTIONS	186
KANARESE CHURCH COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS	189
TRAVANCORE RESOLUTIONS	191
MAKING BOTH ONE	192
THE REAL GOAL	199
POSITION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN INDIA	201
3. CORRESPONDENCE	207
4. CLIPPINGS	209

THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY FOR INDIA

Post Box 501, Park Town, Madras

1931

The Christian Literature Society for India

Post Box 501, Park Town, Madras



Books on Church Union in South India

IN ENGLISH

	Price
	Rs A
THE PROPOSED SCHEME OF UNION (Revised Edition)	
Prepared by the Joint Committee on Union ..	0 6
CHURCH UNION —An Indian View.	
By Dr. A. J. Appasamy ..	0 4
CHURCH UNION IN SOUTH INDIA —The Story of the Negotiations.	
By the Bishop of Madras—S. P. C. K. ..	1 8
THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM —A survey of the present position.	
Edited by Sir James Marchant, K.B.E, LL.D.—CASSELL. 5	0
LAUSANNE, LAMBETH AND SOUTH INDIA —Notes on the present position of the Reunion Movement.	
By N. P. Williams, D.D.—S. P. C. K. ..	1 14

IN TAMIL

SCHEME OF UNION EXPLAINED —Published under the authority of the Joint Committee on Union ..	0 4
--	--------

IN TELUGU

SCHEME OF UNION EXPLAINED —Published under the authority of the Joint Committee on Union ..	0 4
--	--------

SPECIAL INTERCESSION

AND

PRAYERS FOR UNITY

Issued by the Continuation Committee

Available in English and in Tamil

Price, Rs 2-8-0 per 100

CHURCH UNION

News and Views

Editorial Board

THE LORD BISHOP OF MADRAS

REV. J. S. M. HOOPER, M.A.

K. T. PAUL, ESQ., B.A., O.B.E.

REV. J. J. BANNINGA, D.D.

(Managing Editor.)

Publishers

THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY, D. O. M.

PROPOSED SCHEME OF UNION

**The revised edition is now available showing clearly the changes made in the 9th Session of the Joint Committee.
Price : 6 As. To be obtained from the C.L.S.**

MADURA CHURCH COUNCIL

The Madura Church Council passed what are perhaps, up to date, the most favourable resolutions with reference to this Church Union Scheme. This is perhaps natural as from the very beginning of its existence the Church in Madura has been influenced both by Presbyterian and Congregational elements from America and Church of England influences from Tinnevely. Many of the workers in the Indian Church in Madura either have come from Tinnevely themselves or are the children of those that came from Tinnevely and they have brought with them a strong love for the Church of their forefathers. On the other hand, there has of course been in Madura, the direct link connecting the Indian Church with the Puritan movement in England through the Pilgrim Fathers of America and through the liberal wing of the Presbyterian Church, which continued in complete fellowship with the American Board

until 1870. Hence the Church in Madura today rests firmly upon these strong foundations and perhaps in Madura, as nowhere else, the real results of this union will be manifest and we may therefore expect to find all the advantages of Episcopal oversight, Presbyterian fellowship in Councils, and Congregational liberty in the individual churches. It will be an interesting experiment to see how these work out.

The Wesleyan Provincial Synod

It will be seen from the Report in these pages that a thorough discussion of the Scheme took place in the South India Provincial Synod of the Wesleyan Church in January. The fullest opportunity was given for the expression of criticisms of the Scheme, and certain suggestions for modifications in it were made and approved by the Synod. But it is gratifying to note that when this had been done the Synod was able by a unanimous vote to authorize its representatives to continue the consultations on the basis of the Scheme as amended in the meetings of the Ninth Session. There is no doubt that the modifications made in the Ninth Session and the fuller exposition given in the Appendix to the Report of the Ninth Session on the implications of the Scheme in relation to communion and inter-communion, have gone far to remove the misgivings of many. Nevertheless the Synod in its Sixth Resolution frankly recognizes that a great deal of educative work needs to be done before the Churches will be ready for union; it therefore does not send the Scheme down to the Churches for their vote but pledges itself to the necessary work of education in the various Districts. We believe that the Synod has taken a very important step in encouraging its various Districts to form committees whose business it will be to explain the meaning of the Scheme to the people and to bring home to them the larger aspects of union.

The Travancore and Kanarese Councils

The Travancore Council of the South India United Church represents by far the largest section of the S. I. U. C. Out of about two hundred and twenty thousand Christians in the whole of the S.I.U.C., one-half are connected with the Travancore Council. It was therefore of the utmost importance to know what the Christians there feel concerning this Union Movement.

On the one hand, there has been a certain amount of fellowship with the Church of England in Tinnevely. But this affects largely only the southern section of the Travancore Church namely that around Nagercoil. On the other hand, the relation between the S.I.U.C. and the Christians to the north has evidently not been quite so intimate. However there is a very strong feeling among the Christians in Travancore that they

cannot act independently of the London Missionary Society and the Congregational Church in England through which the work in Travancore has so long been supported.

Some of us may think that the Travancore Church should have first of all indicated its own desire and then asked the London Missionary Society whether they would approve of the Indian Church's going forward on that principle. But the Travancore Church has felt it best to consult the L.M.S. first and then to take its action.

As far as we know the Kanarese Churches of the S.I.U.C. have not had very close connections with the members of the Anglican Church. There has been a certain amount of acquaintance, but whether the Churches connected with the S.P.G. have actually fraternised with the Churches of the L.M.S. we do not know and hence cannot affirm or deny. It could hardly have been as friendly as that in Madura and Travancore, however. The Resolutions of the Kanarese Council will also be found in this Number. It is clear from the Resolution that the Council adopted that the details of the Scheme are not clear to them. It is hoped that the Revised Scheme, which is now available in English and will soon be available in the Vernaculars also, will clear up these difficulties. It will, among other things, show that this Scheme does not bind them for all eternity for it is changeable as all human institutions and documents are changeable. Besides there is great liberty allowed to all who enter into union under this Scheme. And the Kanarese Churches themselves will help to form the customs and traditions of the united Church. They will bring in all that they have and will be able to share it with the Wesleyans and Anglicans. The question of the equality of ministers has been clearly shown in the Revised Scheme. The members of the Kanarese Council Churches may safely cast aside their fears and enter boldly, in faith, into the Union proposed.

The General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon

A call has been issued by the Metropolitan for a meeting of the General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon in February, 1932. Some will perhaps think that this meeting should have been held sooner. But when so large an area is concerned and when so many preliminary steps must be taken, through Diocesan Councils and other bodies, a call for such a meeting cannot be issued in a few days' time.

To many the outstanding task of that General Council when it meets will be its decisions concerning the Lambeth Conference Report. Until the General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon makes its own decisions the resolutions of the Lambeth Conference have no standing

in India. Though perhaps many persons would be glad to see the Lambeth Resolutions made operative at once in India that cannot be done except by a vote of the highest Provincial authority which in this case is the General Council. It is sincerely hoped, however, that in February, 1932, this Council will meet and then approve of the Lambeth resolutions making it possible for the bishops in India to carry out the principles contained in those reports. This would probably include permission for the South India dioceses to conclude union on the basis of the Lambeth resolutions and to exercise the privileges given in those resolutions. That decisions involving these matters would have far reaching influence will at once be recognized by those that know the history of the Church of England and that realise the strong desire of many of its members for closer fellowship with other Christians throughout the world.

Laboratory or Museum

This is a scientific age and wonderful discoveries are being made among scientists such as astronomers, biologists, chemists, and physicists, and no less are the students of archaeology making wonderful discoveries. Those recently revealed at Ur of the Chaldees are recognized as having far reaching consequences. The results of all these researches and discoveries will mean much to the increased knowledge of humanity.

In the realm of the Christian Church there are analogies that connect us very closely both with the research workers in the realm of fresh discovery and with those in the realm of archaeology. Whereas biologists and astronomers as well as physicists are discovering fresh principles that were unknown to us before and are showing to us a tremendously increased universe both in its size and in its age, archaeologists are revealing to us many things out of past ages which we did not know before and are showing us that there were civilizations and cultures, hundreds of years before Christ, of whose existence we hardly knew. The question comes to all religious workers 'Am I a discoverer of new principles that will extend the Kingdom of God in this age or am I a digger in ancient ruins trying to find the evidences of what existed hundreds of years ago'? No doubt we need both kinds of workers, but surely he that is working with the living spirit of God among men today building up and extending the Kingdom is dealing with more vital forces than he who is merely rediscovering ancient facts and arranging them in the cabinets of a museum. God is a living power in the world today and we must use His power unto the uttermost. The God who made the stars whose light has taken millions of light-years to reach us is no doubt revealing Himself in these days in ways that were unknown to our forefathers, and we are also finding new evidences of His work in ancient ruins. We must use all He is now teaching us.

Articles

The Need for Retreats

BY REV. A. J. APPASAMY, M.A., D.PHIL.

The nature of the spiritual campaign to be conducted in South India as the different Church bodies consider the Proposed Scheme of Union needs to be carefully worked out at this time. As to whether the different Church bodies will accept the Scheme, and in what spirit, will depend largely upon the nature of the education which is given to people during the next few months on this subject. I should like to propose here that during the year seven or eight carefully planned Retreats should be held in South India for this purpose. The Joint Committee has decided that arrangements should be made for such Retreats but as it is necessary to enlist in this task as many friends of Church Union as possible, I am writing this article.

I

Perhaps it is necessary at the outset to make clear the real need for such spiritual education as can be given only in Retreats. The first and most important reason is that Retreats will give room for a genuine expression of the Indian spiritual temperament. It has been thrown again and again at the Joint Committee and on the friends and advocates of the present Scheme that it is all an attempt to increase the machinery and to perfect the organization of the Church. Many friends in India feel that to impose this Scheme with all its carefully worked out detail and method will be to burden the Indian Church with a large and complicated organization. Organization of some kind is absolutely necessary for the preservation of the highest religious ideals and practices. Retreats provide a suitable atmosphere in which the life of the Church can grow. I would, therefore, plead with friends of Church Union and all those, as a matter of fact, who have on their hearts the urgent need for a spiritual awakening in the Indian Church, to collect people together in different localities during the next few months for considering this matter of Church Union in the spirit of prayer which Retreats so effectively furnish.

The Proposed Scheme of Union has now been before the public in South India for something like two years. Different reactions have been produced by the study of this document. One thing is becoming increasingly evident. It is that the great majority of the people are not

interested in the Scheme. Many of them are good Christian people actively participating in different forms of Christian work and full of concern for the spread of the Kingdom of God in India. But even such people are not interested in the definite proposals for Union which have been made. We have to reckon with this fact. Even now, more or less immediately after the publication of the Scheme, there is a lack of deep interest on the part of most people in South India. It is clear that the Scheme will be considered in detail by different Church bodies and that it will take at least another four or five years before anything like a definite move can be made. Four or five years is the minimum period in which all the Church bodies concerned can accept the Scheme. We have to ask the question as to whether during these four or five years the interest of the Church people can be maintained. It may be alright for experts to gather together and to discuss with minute care and real patience all the issues involved so that future trouble may be avoided by foresight. The more carefully the negotiations are conducted and the more lucidly the terms of agreement are set forth, the more successful the Union of the Churches will be and the less difficult it will be for the organizations of the three Churches to work in harmony. But then most people are not experts and are not interested in such ecclesiastical questions as the powers of various Church authorities and of the limits within which these powers should be used. It is, therefore, necessary that a programme of education should be put on hand which will arouse and keep alive the interest of this majority which is not particularly concerned with matters of Church organization.

There is yet one another reason why Retreats are urgently needed to-day in South India. A paragraph I saw in *The Christian Century* sometime ago has sunk deep into my heart. I have quoted it before and I should like to quote it again. 'Within the United Church there exists considerable anxiety about the vigour of its own spiritual life. The period of controversy and establishment is mainly over, the house is set up, and the question arises whether it provides a home for the soul. The earnest questioning attests that all is not satisfactory but that deadness is not general.'¹ The Indian Church should take a definite warning from this note. We do not know what spiritual education was given to the people of Canada before the Union. But the reference to the present spiritual state of the United Church in Canada convinces us that if the United Church of South India is going to be a real Church, steps should be taken from now on to bring the people together spiritually and not merely in one compact organization. We may be very busy fitting

¹ *The Christian Century*, April 16, 1930.

together the framework and neglect to build the home. If we spend a great deal of time perfecting the machinery and the structure of the Church and forget that the Church is not a collection of ecclesiastical rules and practices but a spiritual home, how can we expect the people to live together in peace and fellowship and in a deeper and a closer understanding of the spirit of Christ when the time comes?

For these reasons it is necessary that a campaign of spiritual education should be carefully organized and carried out during the coming days all over South India.

II

Some suggestions may now be tentatively made as to the way in which these Retreats could be profitably conducted. It is essential that every Retreat should go on for at least a week. Shorter Retreats are apt to be too crowded and too full to give much help. If we attempt to put into three or four days all that we should like a group of people to get in a Retreat, the danger is that from morning till evening a great many meetings and services will be arranged and instead of the leisure and peace which ought to prevail in a Retreat, there will be the busy crowded atmosphere of a heavily arranged conference. It is also wise to insist on long stretches of silence, thus giving opportunity for meditation. When people from Churches where this tradition does not prevail come together they may find it exceedingly difficult to observe complete silence for a week. But everyone, whatever former training he may have had, should be taught to observe long stretches of silence. One way of dealing with the matter would be to have silence during the Retreat at all times except during meal hours. When people come together for their meals they would have some social intercourse. At all other times they would either be attending the meetings or observing silence. These periods of silence would sometimes be profitably spent in spiritual reading. Whatever time is not spent in spiritual reading must be devoted to silent prayer and meditation. It may not be possible to use every minute of the periods of silence in this way. But the training which such a practice will give in meditation and prayer will be found most profitable. The following may be suggested as a day's programme:

6.30-7 a.m	Meditation in Church.
7 -7.30	Prayer and Intercession in Church.
7.30-8.30	Chota Hazri.
8.30-9.30	Bible Study.
9.30-10.30	Address on the Spiritual History of the three Uniting Churches.
10.30-12	Present-day Religious Experience in the three Churches.

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| 12-2.30 p.m. | Midday meal and rest. |
| 2.30-4.30 | Practical proposals for Church Union with discussion. |
| 7.30-8.30 | Evening prayers and devotional address. |

Some of these items may now be explained in detail.

Between 8.30 and 9.30 an address on the spiritual history of the Uniting Churches has been suggested. One of the reasons why some of us are very keen that the Union should go through is that such Union will mediate to the new Indian Church the worthwhile results and positive gains of the spiritual history of these three Churches. The new united Church of India will receive and assimilate some of the really profound and valuable experiences which have made themselves evident in the history of the three Churches. Now the Scheme itself is a definite attempt to bring together in a convenient and practicable form whatever the three Churches have learned in the way of Church organization and doctrine. Every sentence in the Proposed Scheme, almost every phrase, implies a depth of meaning which has emerged in the course of a long history. But a great many Christians in South India do not know the spiritual history behind these three Churches and a careful endeavour should be made to teach them this history. The history of the Puritans may be only vaguely known; a keen Congregationalist could give a series of addresses on the Puritans, setting forth in an interesting way all that they stood for. The Methodist Revival in England may be familiar to the Wesleyans and a knowledge of it in some detail may be presumed in all Wesleyan missionaries and ministers. But the people in the other Churches may not know very much of the Methodist Revival. What a moving story, at once profitable and inspiring, can be told of the great spiritual awakening which is connected with the Wesleys, and the heritage of which is now treasured in the Wesleyan Church. *The Book of Common Prayer*, which to the Anglican is a highly valued Treasury of devotion and religious practice, may be to others who do not know it, nothing but a formal document or a book from which some Anglican priests mumble their prayers. A series of addresses setting forth in a popular way the history of the prayers included in this great devotional masterpiece, with an attempt to make clear the struggles and aspirations, the longings and difficulties of the different saints who composed them, will be a great help to all the members of the uniting Churches. In this way we shall be not merely discussing phrases or sentences because they are felt to embody certain meanings which have emerged in history, but will also know something of the actual history in the course of which these various doctrines and practices, which are sought to be amalgamated in the proposed Union, have come into existence.

In some Retreats biographical studies may well be undertaken during this hour. Biography is a most attractive way of studying history. Especially in Retreats where we expect people with different interests and capacities to come together and where the practical needs of religion have to be emphasised, the biographical approach will be very useful. A series of addresses on some great Bishops will be certainly profitable. The Scheme gives much importance to Episcopacy, and in every Conference on Church Union the powers and responsibilities of Bishops are keenly discussed. We hear a good deal of the abuse which may be made of these powers. A series of addresses sketching the spiritual achievements of some great Bishops will reveal what good Episcopacy has done through the ages. I am just now reading the remarkable biography of Alexander Whyte, the great Presbyterian minister of Edinburgh. The story of his life and of his profound influence would be an inspiring subject of study. If the speaker were skilful he could also weave into his account of Alexander Whyte the way in which Presbyterianism actually works out in Church life.

In the next hour the present religious experiences of people in the three Churches may be studied. In conferences on Church Union constant reference is made to Confirmation. The Anglicans could tell what Confirmation has actually meant in practical life. In the atmosphere of fellowship and prayer provided by a Retreat it will be possible to reveal the inner workings of the soul and to explain to others what the spiritual traditions on which one has been brought up have really meant to one. In this way the spiritual resources of three Churches could be pooled. The object of Church Union is not only to bring together in one organization Christians who have been, till now, following different practices and different traditions. Such a unity in organization is quite necessary. But this unity is only the preliminary to a deeper and more profoundly spiritual unity. Men must be able to worship together and to confer together because it is only in that way they can share with one another their deepest religious experiences. The united Church of South India must be, as has been pointed out, a real spiritual home where people of differing religious convictions and practices can live together and grow together. Retreats will afford, even at this stage, opportunities for members of the negotiating Churches to live together and grow together in this really vital Christian way. The actual proposals for Church Union should be discussed only once in the day. There are many implications in the Scheme which are quite clear to those who drew it up but are not clear to others. Many provisions have to be explained, many rules interpreted. The afternoon meeting could give opportunities for this kind of study of the practical problems which arise from the proposed arrangements.

III

Where Inter-communion services can be held, they should be held in the morning between seven and eight. There is a great difficulty in this direction. The Anglican Church does not permit its members to take Communion from ministers with whom she is not at present in Communion. This makes it impossible for the three uniting Churches to have Inter-communion services. This matter was considered by the Lambeth Conference and certain conclusions were set forth. They will be found on pages 116-17 of the *Lambeth Report*. 'We cannot regard the maintenance of separately organized churches as a matter indifferent or unimportant. The will and intention to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the Body of Christ must of necessity underlie all its organization; and where that unity has been broken, the earnest desire to restore union makes possible a recognition by the Church, in some respects, of ministers which, in separation, must stand on a different footing. The will and intention of Christians to perpetuate separately organized Churches makes it inconsistent in principle for them to come before our Lord to be united as one body by the sacrament of His own Body and Blood. The general rule of our Church must therefore be held to exclude indiscriminate Inter-communion, or any such Inter-communion as expresses acquiescence in the continuance of separately organized Churches.

'From what has been already said it will be evident why we hold as a general principle that Inter-communion should be the goal of, rather than a means to, the restoration of union, and also why the general rule of our Church has been, as set forth by the Lambeth Conference, that members of the Anglican Churches receive the Holy Communion only from ministers of their own Church or of Churches in full communion with it.

'But we recognize that the rule quoted above is a rule of discipline, and as such is subject to exception where the purpose of that discipline can thus be better served. We hold that administration of such a rule of the Church falls under the discretion of the Bishop, who should exercise his dispensing power in accordance with any principle that may be set forth by the national, regional, or provincial authority of the Church in the area concerned. Nor (we hope) will the Bishops of the Anglican Communion question the action of any Bishop who may in his discretion so exercised sanction an exception to the general rule in special areas where the ministrations of his own Church are not available for long periods of time or without travelling great distances, or may give permission that baptized communicant members of Churches not in communion with our own, should be encouraged to communicate in Anglican Churches when

the ministrations of their own Church are not available, or in other special and temporary circumstances.'

During the recent meeting of the Joint Committee these paragraphs were carefully discussed and it was strongly felt that the Bishops in India would be well within their rights if they allowed Inter-communion among the three negotiating Churches. The special and temporary circumstances referred to would probably include such occasions as the present time when negotiations for Union are seriously going on. The Bishops present, however, felt that they could not do anything until they consulted the provincial authority of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon. This would mean that until the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon makes an official statement on this subject there cannot be any Inter-communion. The Provincial Council has been summoned to meet in Calcutta in February 1932, when some pronouncement on this subject may be expected.

This delay is rather unfortunate. The months ahead of us are momentous months. They are months in which the history of the Church in South India is being made. As the different Church bodies consider the Scheme from various points of view and offer different amendments and different criticisms and seek to come together in a spiritual unity, Inter-communion would be of the greatest possible help. Communion is the central act of Christian worship. It is the deepest and most inspiring part of all Christian devotion. If Christians cannot unite together in that, it will be very difficult indeed for them to reach full Christian unity. But it may be unwise to press for an earlier decision from the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon. While the Lambeth Conference has definitely advised that the Union should be inaugurated, the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon has not yet acted on the matter. This means that the proposals would have to be considered by the various Diocesan Councils and the General Council and voted on. There is still a large and influential section of the Anglican Church in India—I refer to the Anglo-Catholics—who are not at all sure of the wisdom and practicability of the proposed Scheme. Their sympathy and their vote should be secured. Now if anything premature is done in the matter of Inter-communion, it may increase the difficulties which the Anglo-Catholics feel. That is why the proposal has been made that the matter of Inter-communion should be decided by the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon as a whole and not by any individual Bishops acting on their own.

Shall we then drop all Retreats? The Anglicans would be the first to acknowledge that the most important item on the programme of a Retreat is the daily Communion. In some places the members of the Free Churches may be prepared to come together and receive Communion where only Anglican priests celebrate. In other places the controversial

aspect may loom so large that such a Communion service will arouse considerable bitter feeling. If such keen sentiment is likely to be aroused, the best thing is to drop the Communion service. On this account, however, all Retreats should not be dropped. A great deal can be gained by our coming together for prayer and study in the way already outlined in this paper.

The movement for Church Union in South India will, I hope, be not so much an ecclesiastical movement in which statesmanship and wisdom are exhibited as a movement for a real spiritual awakening in the Indian Church. There are treasures of devotion and practice and doctrine in the three Churches now remaining separate. Some of these treasures in one Church are not understood, often not even known, by Christians in the other Churches. If the spiritual riches thus kept separately in the different Churches can be brought together, the gain will be tremendous. Because of the coalescing of these streams of rich spiritual life in the three Churches, the entire Indian Church will profit profoundly.

Madura Church Council Resolutions

The General Assembly of the South India United Church which met in Bangalore in October, 1930, remitted the Proposed Scheme of Union, together with certain suggestions for amendment, to the Councils of that Church. For several years the Madura Church Council has had a standing committee on Union which has kept the Church Council informed from year to year with reference to the progress made in the negotiations. The Madura Church has always been recognized as a Council that was favourable to Union. Owing to its history it could hardly have been otherwise, for from the beginning a most friendly fellowship has been enjoyed between the American Missionaries in Madura and the Church of England Missionaries in Tinnevely and the Indian Christian communities in these two districts have also many links of association.

Under the leadership of the Rev. A. A. Martin, the Chairman of our Committee on Union, a report was brought before the meeting of the Church Council in January of this year which definitely asked the Madura Church Council to approve of the Scheme and in a series of resolutions set forth the details of their findings. The report was adopted as follows.

General Principles

"1. The Madura Church Council holds with earnest conviction that God wills unity for His Church on earth and that, therefore, we should desire to participate in every effort by which His holy will in this respect may be accomplished. Especially do we rejoice in the present effort which seeks to unite

our own South India United Church with two other communions in South India and we believe that the successful issue thereof will work toward the furtherance of the Gospel and of the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ in our beloved land.

"2. In regard to the Resolutions of the last General Assembly held in October, 1929, concerning the report of its Committee on Church Union and the proposed 'Scheme of Union'.

"We fully concur as to the necessary basis of union as expressed in 1-2 of its references to us.

Detailed Recommendations

"3. We rejoice to believe that the revisions of the "Proposed Scheme of Union" made by the Joint Committee at its session in November, 1930, the report of which is now before us, adequately meet the desire for certain modifications in the "Scheme" as expressed by the Assembly in its references to us as follows :—

- "(a) Reference II-1 suggesting a change in Section III (B) para. 1 of the "Scheme" so as to make sure that no particular theory of episcopacy is expressed, is met by Resolution 4, of the Joint Committee's Report.
- "(b) Reference II-2 suggesting the association of presbyters along with bishops in the consecrations of bishops, and so changing the provisions of Section III (B)-4 and Section VII Part I (B) (7) is met by Resolution 10 of the Joint Committee's Report.
- "(c) Reference II-3 and 5 regarding freedom in inter-communion in Section IV-B (2) and Section VII, Part I-A (4) of the Scheme are met by Resolution 22 and the Appendix of the Joint Committee's Report.
- "(d) Reference II-4 regarding the status of those ministers from other Churches coming into the united Church before the expiry of thirty years after the union in Section IV-B-(6) of the Scheme is met by Resolution 7 of the Joint Committee's Report.
- "(e) Reference II-6 regarding due consideration of the local congregations in the provisions of Section VII, Part I-A (4), is met in the spirit and meaning of the 'Foreword' to the 'Scheme' which the Joint Committee has adopted.
- "(f) Reference II-7 regarding the bishop's consulting others when in doubt about an ordination, in the provisions of Section VII, Part I-A (3) is met by Resolution 12 of the Joint Committee's Report.
- "(g) Reference II-8 stating that the powers of the bishops as set forth in Section VIII-C (7) seem to be in conflict with the principles of Section XIII-A, has our endorsement.
- "(h) Reference II-9. We trust that the Joint Committee, at its next meeting, will make such provision in the 'Scheme' as to assure all elements in the united Church that whatever changes are made

by the united Church will be so indubitably the work of the Holy Spirit that no definite time limit within which any change may not be made will be considered necessary.

A Great Adventure in Faith

"4. That since the Joint Committee has gone so far in modifying the 'Scheme' to meet the wishes of the last General Assembly, and since we find the other changes made by the Committee to be satisfactory, we believe that the proposed "Scheme of Union" as now revised offers a plan by which our Church can unite with the other two negotiating Churches, and, therefore, we recommend to the General Assembly that it move forward into union on the basis of these proposals as a great adventure in faith, yet fully assured that this union is possible and practicable for our Church, believing that the consummation of such a union is the will of God, that it will certainly result in the outpouring of new power by God and in the consequent upbuilding of the body of the Lord Jesus Christ in this land.

Fellowship with the Past

"5. We request the Mission to inform the American Board of this action, and at the same time assure the Board of our loyalty to the fellowship and the traditions of the past, both with the Board and the Congregational Churches of America.

North India Union Movement

"6. We have heard with joy of the movement for Church Union in North India as revealed by the Round Table Conference held in Delhi, November 18-20, 1930, and pray most earnestly that God will bless those taking part in this movement so that it may carry us further toward the goal we all cherish of a great united Church for all India."

The second portion of this report (Resolutions 3a—h) deals with the suggestions that were placed before its Councils by the General Assembly. The Madura Church Council believed that the meeting of the Joint Committee in November, 1930, dealt with practically all of those suggestions and made such modifications in the Scheme itself that no further action was necessary. As Dr. J. X. Miller one of the leading members of the Church Council said at the time of the meeting 'I think the Joint Committee at its meeting in Madras in November helped many of us to vote for this Scheme because it made us feel that we could really look for and expect a *true union* with the Episcopalians and this is, of course, what we all want.'

It was in this spirit that the Madura Council approved of all these resolutions. There was but one negative vote on the important resolution, No. 4, which faced the whole issue squarely and approved of union on this basis of the Proposed Scheme. The one negative vote proved conclusively

that the members of the Church Council were thinking seriously of the whole matter and that no one voted for the resolution merely as a matter of form. Had any others desired to do so they would have joined the lone member who voted against Resolution No. 4, but none did.

In the case of Resolution 3 (g) and (h) the Council dealt with two of the suggestions of the Assembly that had not yet been dealt with by the Joint Committee. In the former case the Madura Council endorses the action of the Assembly and hopes that the Joint Committee will at its next session find some solution of the problem as to whether the final authority should rest with the Synod or whether it will be possible for the bishops as a group to prevent legislation if they so desire. This is a serious problem and really brings to a head the difference between a Presbyterian form of Government and an Episcopal form. In the one case the chosen representatives of the whole Church act as a body and come to a final decision. In the other case the permanent officers of the Church may as a group prevent the Church from doing what the majority or the whole body of elected representatives may desire to do. The whole Church will still have to give much thought and prayer to this matter in order that the best way out may be found.

With reference to 3 (h) the Madura Church Council does not approve the Assembly enquiry and believes that during the thirty year period there must be freedom within the Church to grow together in the things wherein we are now different. The action of the Assembly in sending forth the suggestion contained in 3 (h) looks very much as though it wished to keep everything exactly as it was at the beginning of the union and that there should be no change at all for thirty years. Since this thirty year period will be very formative for the whole of the future Church anything that would seem to make a custom or tradition static rather than dynamic ought to be discouraged and consequently Madura feels that there should be opportunities to grow together as the Holy Spirit may lead us.

Resolution No. 5 was an expression of the thought of the Madura Church Council that the great heritage it has received from the past through the missionaries of the American Board and the representatives of the Congregational Church in America should not be lost, but that these should be carried forward into the Church after union, in order that they might be used as God's gifts to His Church. One of the great advantages of union will be that all sections of the Church will bring into the united Church their definite contributions and those contributions will all influence one another until we have a Church that represents all the breadth and length and depth of the Love of God as manifested in His Church throughout the ages.

J. J. B.

Wesleyan Methodist Church

South India Provincial Synod, January 1931

CHURCH UNION

(The following resolutions were passed unanimously in every case except where the vote is recorded.)

1. The Provincial Synod received the Report of its Committee on Church Union, and the Report of the Ninth Session of the Joint Committee on Union held in Madras on November 12-15, 1930. It records its profound thankfulness for the growth of the spirit of understanding and sympathy among the representatives of the Churches engaged in these consultations, and in particular for the evidence of the spirit of unity that it finds in the Report of the Ninth Session.

2. The Provincial Synod authorizes its representatives on the Joint Committee to continue the consultations on the basis of the 'Proposed Scheme of Union' as amended in the Report of the Ninth Session of the Joint Committee on Union, held in Madras in November 1930, and instructs them to endeavour to secure such further modifications as may seem desirable in the light of the following resolutions.

3. The Synod having gone carefully through the Report of the Ninth Session of the Joint Committee expresses the following judgement on the modifications made in response to the suggestions of the Provincial Synod of 1930.

(1) *With reference to the Episcopacy*

We consider that the modifications suggested by the South India Provincial Synod under this head have been satisfactorily met as follows :—

- A. With reference to Apostolic Succession, by Resolution 4 of the Report.
- B. With reference to the limitation of the powers of the Bishop, by Resolutions 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16.
- C. With reference to the continuation in office of a Bishop, by Resolution 17.

But with reference to Resolution 17 the Provincial Synod instructs its representatives on the Joint Committee to secure that nothing shall be inserted in the constitution of the United Church to deprive a diocesan Council of the right to represent its views to the Moderator and the Synod, if it is firmly convinced that its bishop is mentally, physically or otherwise incapable of duly discharging the duties of his office.

- D. With reference to the suggestion that no further ordination shall be required of any Minister previous to his consecration as a Bishop, we are satisfied with the opinion expressed by the recent Lambeth Conference,

(2) *With reference to Ministers*

We welcome the assurance of the Joint Committee that the acceptance of Episcopal Ordination as the rule of the United Church does not involve denial of the validity of the Ministry of Non-Episcopal Churches. (See Resolution 5).

4. We also welcome statements in Resolution 9, paragraphs 2 and 4, that the Joint Committee is prepared (a) to co-operate heartily with the Senior Wesleyan Chaplain in carrying on the work in this area for which he is responsible to Government and (b) to promote wider fellowship by common counsel with the Wesleyan Church in North India, in Burma and in Ceylon.

5. We note that the question of the position of the English Churches in the United Church will be considered in the next meeting of the Joint Committee. We are of opinion that the present system of recruiting the ministers of those Churches in England should be continued after the Union is consummated.

6. We are aware that the scheme of Union has not yet caught the imagination of our people in general and this state of things is largely due to their ignorance of its proposals. We therefore realise that much educative work remains to be done before the churches will be ready for Union. We give our hearty approval to the suggestions made in Resolutions 25 and 26 of the Report, that such work should be carried on, amongst other ways, by means of retreats and conferences. We pledge ourselves to promote the spirit of Union in this and other ways during the coming year. In each District committees have been formed to carry on educative work in relation to Union.

7. We have heard statements from the members of the Joint Committee with reference to the attitude of members of the Anglican Church to the question of Inter-Communion. We desire to record our deep appreciation of that attitude as expressed in paragraph 24 of the Report. We would repeat our previous Resolution. 'In our judgment it will help greatly to increase the spirit of unity between the consulting Churches, and within our own Church to win the mind of our people, if even before Union is consummated united worship, and especially inter-communion, between the consulting churches can be made possible. The absence of inter-communion at this time constitutes a most formidable obstacle to union in the minds of our people'.

8. We heartily approve the Foreword and Appendix to the Report. We are convinced that the statements therein contained and the spirit of sincere desire for the Unity of Christ's body manifested thereby will go far to dissipate the apprehensions which have troubled the minds of many.

N.B.—We suggest that in the Foreword, p. 3, line 4, instead of 'essential' should be read 'of great importance'. The sentence would then read 'The preservation of these three elements in its organization is of great importance to the good order of the Church.'

9. With reference to the question of adding an explanation of the meaning of the pledge in Section IV. B. 3 mentioned *Ang. 6 (a)* on p. 12 of the Report of the Ninth Session, the Provincial Synod instructs its delegates on the

Joint Committee to represent its opinion that it would be most inadvisable to add any explanation of the meaning of the pledge which would have the effect of placing hindrances in the 'process of growing together' which is the aim and purpose of the Union.

10. The Provincial Synod instructs its representatives to ask the Joint Committee to consider the insertion in Section III. B, 1st para. after the phrase 'But this acceptance does not bind the United Church to the acceptance of any particular theory concerning Episcopacy' of the words 'as a distinct order of Ministry' and the substitution 'or' for 'either'.

The whole sentence would then read—

'But this acceptance does not bind the United Church to the acceptance of any particular theory concerning Episcopacy as a distinct order of Ministry or as a qualification for the Ministry or as a determining factor in its relations with other Churches.'

(Vote : 31 for, 1 against, 6 neutral.)

10. (a) This Synod is of opinion that the grave misgivings some Ministers and members of our Church have about the acceptance of Episcopacy as an integral part of the basis of Union will be very greatly mitigated when it is clearly realized that acceptance of Episcopacy as a method of Church government does not bind them to the theory that there are essentially different orders of the Ministry. The ministers of a diocese are all shepherds of Christ's flock, among whom the Bishop stands as first among equals.

11. With reference to Resolution 19 on the consecration of bishops, the Provincial Synod would welcome the inclusion of the following statement as a note to Section VII. Part I.B. (7)

'In view of the common desire to carry over from the uniting Churches into the United Church all elements which may in any way contribute to the fullest expression of truths which have been valued in the Christian Church, it shall be permissible for presbyters to join with the bishops in the laying on of hands at the consecration of a bishop; provided that it always be remembered and taught that the true Consecrator is God to whom prayer is made.'

12. The Synod accepts all the other resolutions of the Ninth Session of the Joint Committee.

13. The Provincial Synod requests the Joint Committee to consider the desirability of conference between the North and South of India in the hope that both may be brought to the acceptance of such a basis of Union as will lead to the formulation of a scheme of Church Union for the whole of India.

14. This Provincial Synod is of opinion that it would further the interests of Union not only in South India but in the whole of India, Burma and Ceylon if closer contact were established between the members of the three Provincial Synods of the Wesleyan Church. We suggest that this might be achieved

(1) If invitations were sent to the other two Provincial Synods asking them to send delegates as visitors to all further meetings of the Joint Committee on Union in South India.

- (2) If similar representation of this Provincial Synod were arranged at any further discussions on Union which may take place either in N. India or in Burma or Ceylon.
- (3) If some meeting or conference could be arranged for between members of the three Indian Provincial Synods at some early date to consult together regarding the various proposals which have been made for the Union of the Wesleyan Church with other Churches.

It is proposed that the Secretary of the Union Committee should correspond with the Chairmen of the Provincial Synods in order to ascertain their views on these proposals and to take immediate steps to carry out the arrangements herein suggested.

15. The Synod instructs the Standing Committee to continue its consideration of the question of the status of our Ministers in the United Church in relation to the Methodist Conference in England and the future relation of the Missionary Committee to our present work. (See P. S. Minutes 1930, p. 17, para. 6.)

16. In view of the continual extension of the work of God in this Provincial area and the increasing burden which is laid upon us by the care and nurture of the rapidly growing Christian Church, in Hyderabad especially, this Synod is anxious to receive some assurance from our Church at home that the work entrusted to us will not be allowed to suffer, either from lack of prayerful interest or of financial support, should Union eventually take place.

Kanarese Church Council Resolutions on the Proposed Scheme of Union

The Kanarese Church Council had before it the Proposed Scheme of Union referred to it by the General Assembly, and discussed it in detail. Despite the fact that there have been sincere attempts made in the Churches to understand the scheme, the members felt that they were not prepared to accept the Scheme as it stands for the following reasons:—

- (1) Because the scheme is not available in Kanarese, the ordinary Church member is not able to understand the issues involved.
- (2) Many of the proposals are alien to the thought and practices of our Kanarese Churches hitherto.
- (3) They feel that it is not fair to ask them to decide now the form of government under which they are to live for all time to come.

While eager for the union of the Churches, they feel that the present scheme fails to conserve in the proposed United Church the distinctive contribution of the Free Churches. It is also implied that some of the Free Church practices are irregularities which will disappear within thirty years.

In spite of the claim that the scheme offers complete freedom to the United Church to develop along its own lines, they feel that the line of development is already fixed.

While the above represents the feeling of the Kanarese Church Council with regard to the scheme as a whole, the Amendments, one to nine, proposed by the General Assembly were accepted by the Council with the exception of No. 4. In lieu of this amendment the Kanarese Church Council proposes that Section IV (B) (6) of the scheme be deleted, for the following reasons :—

(1) This Council holds to its resolution of 1920, that bishops and presbyters shall be regarded as belonging to the same order. (Therefore a minister coming from abroad who has been ordained by presbyters is as truly ordained as if he had been ordained by a bishop.)

(2) One of the bases of union is that all the ministers of the uniting churches are acknowledged as ministers of the word and the sacraments in the United Church, which basis is not adhered to in the section proposed to be deleted.

(3) If this proposal stands, it will in time break the much valued fellowship with the Free Churches abroad.

The Kanarese Church Council also desires that in the United Church there should be greater scope for the service of women. At present women preach, help in the administration of the sacraments and serve on all courts of the church. It wishes that the United Church of India should not lose their services in these capacities.

The Kanarese Church Council further proposes the following amendments :—

(1) In place of the rule in Section VIII (C) (2) which reads 'The Moderator and Deputy Moderator shall be elected from among the bishops of the Church', the rule shall read 'The Moderator and Deputy Moderator shall be elected alternately from the ministers (bishops and ministers) and laymen of the Church'.

(2) In Section XIII (A) (4) instead of 'three-quarters majority of the Synod', the rule shall read 'majority of the Synod'.

(3) In Section XIII (B) (2) instead of 'by a two-thirds majority of the Synod', the rule shall read 'by a majority of the Synod',

In conclusion, the Kanarese Church Council urges that in the event of the failure of the present scheme for Organic Union, further efforts along the line of Federation be made for the closer co-operation of the Churches in South India.

JONATHAN ABEL,

Secretary,

Kanarese Church Council.

Travancore Resolutions

A Special Meeting of the Church Council. This was held at Trivandrum on the 14th and 15th of January. A solemn resolution of condolence on the death of Rev. J. M. Kesari, B.A., was passed by the meeting, standing. Rev. J. E. Kesari, M.A., Pastor of Nagercoil, was elected Vice-President of the Council till the next annual meeting and nominated to represent the Council on the Madras Representative Christian Council. The special business for which the Council met was the consideration of the Proposed Scheme of Union. The four members in the Council who are on the Joint Committee on Union explained different parts of the Scheme. As there were many members in the Council who could not follow the Scheme in English, it was explained in Tamil. Yet the want of a Tamil translation of the whole Scheme operated as a serious handicap to its proper understanding by a great number of the members. After two sessions of long discussion, at the end of the third, the following resolutions were passed :—(1) That the Council will not make any final decision regarding acceptance of the Proposed Scheme of Union before it has received the Board's reply to its letter approved by the Annual Meeting of September 1930 and submitted to the Directors. (2) That whilst we fully believe that the Proposed Scheme is a serious attempt to reconcile and co-ordinate the beliefs and practices of the uniting Churches and whilst we appreciate the spirit which underlies the proposals, we do not feel that we can express our approval of the Scheme until we have assured ourselves regarding certain matters such as the historic episcopate, freedom of thought and practice, financial commitments, the attitude of the Board, etc. (3) That vernacular translations of the Scheme be made available to the delegates and Churches and that upon the receipt of an answer from the Foreign Secretary to our letter of September 1930, the office-bearers shall be authorized to convene a special meeting of the Council at Trivandrum before the August 1931 meeting, if possible in June, for final discussion and decision.

It is hoped that when the Tamil and Malayalam translations of the Scheme are available, the Churches and their leaders will make an unprejudiced study of it and allow themselves to be led by the Spirit of God.

PAUL DANIEL,

Secretary.

Making Both One—Is it Possible?

The South Indian Church Union Scheme was expounded recently in a Fellowship at which a theological professor, who is one of the clearest thinkers in Methodism, was present. After the exposition he stated that while there was much in the Scheme itself, and still more in the fact that such a Scheme had been framed at all, that commanded his heartiest sympathy, yet there were certain fundamental difficulties concerning which he could not make up his mind. His impulse was, whenever he heard the word 'Union' to put up his hand in favour of it. So far indeed, it seemed to him, that every gulf that separated church from church could ultimately be bridged—except the very one that the South Indian Scheme seeks to bridge. The Scheme involves the acceptance of the Historic Episcopate, on the distinct understanding that this acceptance does not carry with it any particular theory as to the nature of Episcopacy. Yet there will be in the United Church two distinct sections, one holding the Protestant and Evangelical theory as to the nature of the Church and Ministry and Sacraments, and the other the Catholic and Sacerdotal theory. Is a real union possible under these conditions, or does the cleavage go so deep as to involve irreconcilable principles? The division in this case is not merely one that has been imposed upon the Indian Churches by the missionaries from the west. It goes back to primitive Christianity. Paul had to wage a great fight for freedom against the legalistic tyranny which the Judaizing element would have imposed upon the young Gentile Churches. The cleavage indeed goes further back still, for it lies behind the great assertion of the Prophets that no particular outward ritual is essential in religion. Is it really possible to combine these two opposing points of view in one Church so as to have spiritual unity as well as corporate union? The illustration of comprehension as it is found in the Church of England is hardly a happy one as evidenced by the present condition of that Church, and the attitude of the 'Catholic' and 'Protestant' sections one to the other in connection with the new Prayer Book. The speaker said that he had never heard any advocate of the South India Scheme really face up to the problem as to whether the Catholic and Evangelical views of the Ministry and Sacraments are not really irreconcilable and therefore any real union in one Church of representatives of the two schools of thought, absolutely impossible. That this is the case the extreme Anglo Catholic and the extreme Free Churchman would agree in asserting. Are they right and have those who have framed the Scheme evaded fundamental disagreement which must ultimately wreck the proposed union?

Now it must be granted that corporate union between the extreme Anglo-Catholic and any non-episcopal church on the one hand, or say

extreme Congregationalists and an episcopal church on the other are alike unthinkable, for the extremes meet in common impasse. On the one side you have the Sacerdotalist insisting that 'without the use of particular material medium there is no guarantee of spiritual experience in the Church',¹ the material media in this case being the imposition of hands by a bishop who is in the Apostolic Succession, which imposition conveys, and is not merely the symbol of, spiritual grace. Those who hold this position rigidly and whole-heartedly, as do the signatories to the Anglo-Catholic Manifesto of September 1929, cannot conscientiously consent to unite with a non-episcopal Church except on the condition of the re-ordination of the ministers of that Church. Those ministers however cannot be false to what they believe is the plain teaching of the New Testament, and still less to the reality of their own spiritual experience and consciousness of a Divine call to the ministry; which indeed are not their personal experience alone but which are common to the history of the non-episcopal Churches everywhere. To accept re-ordination would be to deny the call of God, and the work of His Spirit in their own ministry and in the life of the Churches to which they belong. But the impossibility of union in this case arises from the refusal of the Anglo-Catholics to admit, what the Church of England Representatives on the Joint Conference at Lambeth did admit, namely, 'that ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's Word and administer the Sacraments as Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the Church concerned, are real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church.'²

On the other hand the extreme Congregationalist says in effect, 'We will not have Episcopacy, with or without Apostolic Succession, at any price.' The essential condition on which union with the Anglican Church is to be allowed is the abandonment of a practice that 'prevailed universally from the second to the sixteenth centuries and in three-quarters of Christendom today',³ and which has been the foundation of Church government in the Church of England through all the centuries of its history. This is to ask even the evangelical Churchman to disown his past, and to be disloyal to his present religious experience which are as real and precious to him as are the history and experience of the Churches to us. Union along these lines is no less impossible than acceptance of the demands of the Catholics, Anglo or Roman.

The attitude of mind which demands it is in effect as intransigent and impossible as that of the Roman Church itself in its insistence upon submission to the Papacy, and the average Anglican is as little able to accept

¹ Ryder Smith, *The Sacramental Society*, p. 45.

² *The Church of England and the Free Churches*, p. 46.

³ B. P. Palmer, *Review of the Church*, Jan, 1930, p. 38.

the one ultimatum as the other. The Indian ministers at Tranquebar were surely on the right lines when they insisted that the united Church in India must conserve the three elements of Episcopacy, Presbyterianism and Congregationalism, and that real union must be achieved not on the principle of compromise for the sake of peace but of comprehension for the sake of truth. Enduring union cannot be based on wiping out the ecclesiastical identity of any of the contracting parties, or achieved by the creation of a new type of Church life and government utterly unlike anything that has gone before.

Real union therefore on an exclusive basis, whether from the Anglican or Free Church side is utterly impossible. That real union is possible on an inclusive basis in which whatever is worth while in the treasury of each Church shall be made available for the upbuilding of the whole is the firm belief of those who have helped to frame the Scheme. The rationale of such a faith must be in something more vital than expediency, something deeper and more fundamental than all our divisions and differences. That which unites must be deeper than that which divides; the chasm must be bridged from below (if an Irishism may be allowed) and not from above. To change the figure there is only one foundation deep enough and broad enough to bear the weight of such a structure of union as the Scheme desires to erect, and that is the realization of the spiritual unity of all the Churches concerned; the fact that they are already members of the One Church which is His Body. To put it very plainly if we are already one in Christ and love Him well enough, cannot we under the inspiration of His Spirit, love one another well enough to unite in a visible Church, even though we hold different views as to the meaning of Apostolic Succession? If not, then there is something bigger in that which divides us than in the spiritual facts and forces that unite us. The crucial question is, which is the more important, our common love and loyalty to Christ, nay more, the certainty of our oneness in Him and our sure faith in the guidance of the Spirit in the future development of the united Church; or our peculiar views as to sacramental grace, and episcopal ordination and apostolic succession?

The impossibility of enduring organic union can only arise on the one side from a virtual denial of the great spiritual fact that underlies even our most patent divisions; and on the other from a failure to realise to the full, the implications of the fact of the existing spiritual unity of all true believers in Jesus Christ. The Church which is His Body is by its very nature ONE, or it could not be His Body, no matter how deeply and tragically divided the Christian Church may be. On the Free Church side there is no disposition to question this fact, it is one of the commonplaces of our ecclesiastical belief, and is indeed admitted by a considerable section of the Anglican Church, though denied by militant

Anglo-Catholics. But in India there is a real recognition of this fact even on the Catholic side, and curiously enough a clearer understanding of the implications of the fact than there is amongst certain sections, on the Free Church side whether there or here. The essential thing is that though at present outwardly divided, we are all members of the one Body of Christ. What doth hinder then our expressing that realized vital unity in outward corporate union? This is what really lies behind the Scheme, and it has been the growing realization of our oneness in Christ that has made its preparation possible. To quote from a sermon preached by Bishop Tubbs of Tinnevely, at Bangalore, in July 1928, when the Joint Committee was working on the Scheme,

'We are not seeking the absorption of one Church by another. We Anglicans, for example, are not seeking to make the S. I. U. C. and the Wesleyans join our Church. God forbid that we should try to. We have too many faults and failures of our own to try and impose our Church upon others. Nor are we seeking to make a new Church. What we are trying to do is to show visibly to the world that we are already—"one in Christ". In spite of our sins and weaknesses, in spite of our pride and stubbornness, our Lord has been working in each part of His divided body and He is now drawing us together so that we may share the good things which He has taught us in our separation. Reunion will mean that we shall pool our spiritual resources.'

The acknowledgment of 'all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ which is His Body', is the most striking evidence of the guidance of the Spirit in the Lambeth Appeal, and it is emphasised in the Bishops Encyclical letter when they say, 'The unity which we seek exists. It is in God, who is the perfection of unity, the one Father, the one Lord, the one Spirit Who gives life to the one Body. Again the one Body exists. It needs not to be made, nor to be remade, but to become organic and visible. Once more the fellowship of the members of the one Body exists. It is the work of God not of man. We have only to discover it, and to set free its activities.' It is true that the Lambeth Conference could not see its way to accept the full implication of its own admissions; they stumbled at the idea of admitting into the united Church, the ministers of other Communions without Episcopal re-ordination. Now the vital difference between the South Indian proposals and those of Lambeth is just this, that all the ministers of the uniting Churches are to be accepted as ministers of the Word and of the Sacraments without re-ordination. Surely in this recognition of the existing essential spiritual unity of the three Churches we may see a repudiation of the Sacerdotal opinion that any particular symbol is essential to the being of a Church, for according to Dr. Ryder Smith in his *Sacramental Society*, 'the admission of the present ministers of the Free Churches into the united

Church without re-ordination' is a token of repudiation¹ such as he at any rate would accept. Judged by this test the Scheme does provide for a real union between Catholic and Protestant just because it is Catholic enough not to be Sacerdotal. If both sections are already part of the One Body of Christ and this is recognized on both sides as fundamental, why should they not venture on the experiment of giving expression to that unity in corporate union and living together as One Church acknowledging the Lordship of the One Living Head?

But some will say, 'Which conception of things will ultimately prevail the Catholic or the Protestant'? Why should either ever prevail? May it not be true as a Madras Wesleyan missionary put it in an article in the *Madras Mail* when our Church came into the negotiations:—

'The deepest question of all is this:—'Is Catholicism (not of the comparatively modern Roman kind—that we must regretfully regard as, for the present, outside our purview; but of the kind represented by the best Anglican tradition) really incompatible with Protestantism? Must they be in conflict till (if ever) one defeats the other? If so, then all our talk about Union is the emptiest nonsense. For it is, I take it, quite absolutely certain, that in this century at least, Anglican Catholicism is not going to capitulate; nor Protestantism either. Is it not probable rather that Catholicism at its best and Protestantism at its best are different sides of one great whole, the nave and transept which it is God's purpose to build together into one great temple wherein may worship North and South and East and West and be at peace together?'

I can only deal very briefly with the bearing upon the whole question of the speaker's references to the cleavage as revealed in the Old and New Testaments, and the working of 'comprehension' in the Church of England itself. Though the Old Testament is the record of the constantly conflicting ideals of the priest and the prophet, and though the glory of the latter was the assertion of the great truth that no particular outward ritual is essential in religion, it does finally give us a synthesis of the two ideals in Ezekiel and the Priestly Code and the Psalms. As Dr. Ryder Smith puts it:—

The Old Testament closes with the inward and the outward—the spiritual the moral, the ritual—in their right places. God wills the third as well as the first and the second, if only it be their servant and not their master or substitute. It is the spiritual that validates the ritual, not the ritual that guarantees the spiritual. This is the final finding of the Old Testament. Israel was a Sacramental Society.'

While the scales are heavily loaded, especially in the pre-exilic prophets, against Sacerdotalism, Sacramentalism (of which Sacerdotalism is a perversion) had its place in the development of the religious life of the covenant people of God, and the priest as well as the prophet may claim to be necessary in order to the outworking of that covenant relation-

¹ See also Bishop Waller, *Church Union in South India*, p. 95.

ship in its fullness. His task was as essentially conservative as the other's was creative, in the ever unfolding knowledge of the mind and will of God. May we not hope that in the United Church the two elements will work together side by side for the glory of the Lord of Truth, and the upbuilding of His covenant people, the new Israel according to the Spirit, in their faith and hope and love?

As far as the New Testament evidence of the conflict between the dominant ideas of spiritual liberty and Jewish legalism is concerned, there is no shadow of doubt as to the attitude of Paul. The attempt on the part of representatives of the Jewish Church to impose circumcision upon the Gentile converts, as the essential condition of admission to the Christian Church, he resisted constantly and fiercely, but there is not the slightest evidence that he regarded that Church with its own observance of the rite as outside the pale or excommunicate. Even in the vehement denunciation of the Judaizers which runs like molten metal through his letter to the Galatians there is no hint of any desire on his part to unchurch those who practised the rite. Paul does not seek the solution of the problem with which he was faced in the permanent organization of Jewish and Gentile Christians into two separate and irreconcilable Churches; nor, while prepared to resist to the death the attempt to make circumcision binding upon the Gentile section of the Church, does he desire that the Jewish section should repudiate it altogether for themselves. His attitude and experience may be taken as evidence that union between two such parties is impossible when either seeks to dominate the other, though not impossible on a basis of mutual toleration. 'The love of Christian freedom and the desire for Christian unity were twin influences at work in his whole life and ministry.'¹

The situation in the Church of England is admittedly not a happy one, but whether it can be finally cited for or against the possibility of uniting Catholic and Evangelical, Sacerdotalist and Sacramentalist, in one Church must depend upon future developments. It is possible that the South Indian Scheme may bring things to a climax, and supply us with an answer one way or another. It may be granted without hesitation that the combination is impossible in the Church of England or any other, if either or both of the two schools of thought take up a rigidly exclusively position and in consequence seek either to absorb or squeeze out the other side. With regard to the Anglican Church, one must be very pessimistic, or optimistic as the case may be, to believe that either absorption of the Evangelicals by the Catholics or *vice versa* will ever take place. The squeezing out process would result in disruption. This might facilitate union between the Anglo-Catholics and the Roman Catholics on the one

¹ A. W. F. Blunt, *Clarendon Bible*, Salatin, p. 64.

hand and between the Evangelicals and the Free Churches on the other, but it can hardly be regarded in itself as a consummation devoutly to be wished.

With regard to the Scheme, it is obvious that the absolutely exclusive view with its choice between absorption and expulsion does not hold. The idea of absorption has been expressly repudiated from the Anglican side in the statement already quoted from Bishop Tubbs, and there is certainly no desire for it on the part of the S. I. U. C. or the Wesleyans. If there had been any such irreconcilable spirit among those on the Joint Committee, the Scheme would never have materialised. But there has been mutual accommodation. The Scheme accepts the Historic Episcopate in a constitutional form as the basis of union; 'it being understood that no particular interpretation of the fact of the Historic Episcopate is thereby implied or shall be demanded from any minister or member of the united Church.' But while this acceptance of Episcopacy does make this particular ecclesiastical symbol obligatory in the Church, the admission of the Free Church ministers without re-ordination indicates that it is not regarded as absolutely essential to the existence of the Church. It should be borne in mind in this connection that the Anglican Church itself is not committed to any particular theory of Apostolic Succession. Bishop Waller of Madras in his little book on the proposed Union says:—

In the Church of England there is no official theory. The Ordinal states that the three Orders have existed in the Church from the Apostles' time and provides a form of ordination for use in the Church of England for all who have not previously received episcopal consecration or ordination. But it lays down no theory of Apostolic Succession, and there are many members of the Church who subscribe to no theory, accepting only the fact of the Historic Episcopate.

Bishop Palmer of Bombay, himself an Anglo-Catholic, is equally emphatic that the acceptance of the Historic Episcopate by the non-episcopal Churches does not imply the acceptance by those Churches of the rigid theories of Apostolic Succession and the validity of the sacraments as held by members of his own school of thought. (*Review of the Churches*, Jan. 1930, p. 38.)

With reference to the last remark of Bishop Waller it should be remembered that there is a considerable element in the Church of England that utterly repudiates the extreme sacerdotal view. Their own view is expressed in following para. from the Statement of the Anglo-Evangelical Group Movement:—

That episcopacy belongs to the well being of the Church, and that it provides the most hopeful means for securing reunion we cordially recognize; that it is essential to the existence of a Church we deny. We also gladly admit that the Spirit of God guided the early Church to adopt as the result of its

experience, the episcopal form of government, but that same Spirit has used and blessed other forms of Church government.¹

It may be that in the Church of England the Establishment is the bond which holds Catholic and Evangelical together in the Communion and that if this were removed they would fall apart. Fortunately in the case of the united Church of the Scheme this external bond will be non-existent. Its place will be taken by the threefold cord of faith and hope and love, and the greatest of these is love.

W. E. GARMAN

The Real Goal

The reports of discussions on Church Union would fill a very bulky volume. Presumably every point has been examined, every part of the scheme discussed. Have we thereby gained the vision of the Church united? Do we clearly see the goal before us? Or are we really as much in the dark as the blind men who examined the elephant piece-meal; and as men so busy with the obstacles in the race that the goal is hidden from our view?

In a matter of this kind is the inductive method the most fruitful of results? Should we not accomplish more by the deductive way? Why not try the novel method of starting from the goal and running back over the course? Many obstacles would be more easily tackled that way. And if we start with the vision of the whole, shall we not the better obtain an understanding of the relative value of each part?

Have not our discussions been too church-centric, doctrine-centric, and too little Christ-centric? What is the finished picture that we desire, and the goal after which we strive? Is it not, on the religious side, a fellowship of all those who are loyal to Jesus Christ as Saviour, Guru and God? And, on the social side, is it not a fellowship of brethren in which religion binds still closer, rather than divides, those of different churches; and which unites with deeper significance those whom duty sends to distant places with those who are already there bearing their Christian witness, so that together they may be cheered, and helped and strengthened.

Why not start as if Church Union were already accomplished, and then work out its implications? If so, what should we have? We should have many folds but one flock; many churches but one Church; diversities of gifts and operations but one Spirit; many interpretations but one faith; varying expressions of worship but unity in love and adoration. We should have inter-communion and inter-celebration as the

¹ *Review of the Churches*, April 1930, p. 323.

foundation of the greater, wider Church, and not the pinnacle of the finished product. We should have united efforts to spread the kingdom of Christ than which there is no better way of binding our hearts in love and concord. We should have a united front against the atheism and secularism of our day, and a united home into which to win the many who know of Jesus but who wait to see the signs of His presence in His Church and to feel the warmth of His love among His disciples.

Does this seem a rather fantastic suggestion to make? My reply is that this is practically what the Union Joint Committee have endeavoured to do each time they have met both in their prayers and in their deliberations. They have met as ministers of the Word and Sacraments and endeavoured from that point of view to see how to overcome the difficulties that have separated them. And I do emphasise that the spirit must come before the letter, unity before union, full mutual recognition and acceptance before any scheme of united worship and joint service.

Now 'Lambeth' has failed to help us here, and fallen lower than its high level of ten years ago when it sent out its fine appeal for union. Its victory in July was won within itself. At the cost of a still more stirring summons to Christian unity throughout the world, a schism among its own ranks was only prevented by a unanimous decision to bless the scheme of South India, but to stand apart from it; just as the Government in relation to educational projects will allow Missions to experiment but should failure ensue, the loss must be borne by the Mission, should success attend the effort, then the Government will help to gather in the fruit. Certainly the attitude that: 'those Anglicans who take Communion in the United Church or take up work under it, will not be considered as having done anything worthy of censure' is not inspiring for pioneer effort. According to the Scheme as it stands, the immediate benefit of Union, say 'Inter-communion', will be largely neutralized by the return to the water-tight compartment system till progressively the ministers of non-episcopal ordination die out. If it is said that the situation will be progressively changed by 'our growing together', the question comes: what right from history have we of thinking that the situation will change for the better? The Roman Catholic Church has not changed one tittle in its attitude to Anglo-Catholics; and Anglo-Catholics have not changed one whit in their view on these matters; in spite of the liberalising influences of today in both theology and life. I make bold to say that there is no pulpit or Communion Table in the Wesleyan or South India United Church which is not open to any Minister of the Word and Sacraments who comes not to put forward some churchism or to press some shibboleth, but to preach the glorious gospel of Christ.

Have the Bishops and Clergy done similar service to educate the conscience of their congregations to a similar Christian standard? Free

Churchmen are ready to go forward to still greater freedom in the Spirit, and still wider unity in the service of the Kingdom; but they can hardly be expected to wax enthusiastic over any scheme that would make them feel that their previous Ministry had been deficient in validity and value.

What is not in the bud will not come out in the blossom. So I press for absolute equality, unequivocal recognition, and genuine unity from the start. Let us start from the end, and we shall find that instead of retrogression we have placed our feet upon the path of true progress.

RALPH ROBERTSON.

The Position of the Church of England in India

BY REV. W. E. EVANS (*Palamcottah*)

The History of the Church of England in India varies considerably in different parts of the country. The diocese of Travancore has just been celebrating its Jubilee; in Tinnevely both missions have celebrated their Centenary, in Calcutta we are reminded of the Church of St. John built by Warren Hastings and in Madras the Church of St. Mary in the Fort claims even greater history.

It would not be easy in a short article to deal adequately with the organization of the Church as a whole; and I shall therefore confine my remarks to the diocese of Tinnevely, the sphere of work with which I am most acquainted.

The first Bishop of this Church in India was appointed to Calcutta in the year 1814. Before that time the Bishop of London had the episcopal oversight of India and Australia, but as may be understood, he did not often visit the outstations of his diocese. The first missionary society of the Church of England was the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge which was founded in 1698 as a private society. Apparently at that time it was very difficult to secure missionaries and the S.P.C.K. selected Germans and Danes of the Lutheran Church trained in their own country and ordained according to their own rite, but they came to England for instruction before sailing. In 1705 Frederick IV, King of Denmark, received a petition from a poor widow whose husband had been murdered at Tranquebar. The King appealed to his chaplain for men and as a result, Bartholomew Ziegenbalg was sent to India at the King's expense together with a fellow-student Henry Plutsch. The story of the arrival and landing

of these two pioneers; of the opposition of the Danish Government and their consequent trials; of their extraordinary industry, patience and devotion, are the most thrilling in the whole history of Missions. The greatest work of Ziegenbalg was the translation of the New Testament and part of the Old into Tamil, the first Indian version of the Scriptures. He visited Europe in 1715 and in England he was received warmly by King George the First and the Archbishop of Canterbury. Returning to India, he died in 1719 at the age of thirty-six leaving behind him 350 Tamil converts, some schools, the Tamil Scriptures just mentioned, a Tamil Dictionary and a Grammar. One of the greatest successors of Ziegenbalg was Christian Frederick Schwartz who came out in 1749. Under Schwartz the Mission extended far beyond Tranquebar, from Madras to Tinnevely over the whole Tamil country. It is recorded that at least 50,000 from the Tamil country were baptized before the close of the century. These Missions, unlike Tranquebar itself, were not under the Danish administration, but were more directly the work of the S.P.C.K., though missionaries came from the German source.

In 1778 Schwartz paid his first visit to Tinnevely. During this visit Clorinda, a Maratha Brahman widow, originally attached to the Royal family at Tanjore, was baptized. In 1780 the Mission took an organized shape by the formation in the town and fort of Palamcottah of a small congregation. Bishop Caldwell discovered many years later in Tanjore the first Tinnevely Church register containing the names of forty Christians, who constitute the first Palamcottah congregation, in which thirteen different castes were represented. Clorinda, having obtained a few materials from English friends, completed, largely at her own expense, the small, but substantial Church in Palamcottah. Schwartz came to Palamcottah and consecrated the Church, which became a place of worship both for English and Tamil Christians for the next forty years. Sathianathan, a Catechist, was placed permanently at Palamcottah in charge of the work, and the appointment proving a success, in 1790 he was ordained priest by Schwartz according to the Lutheran form and given charge of the Mission work in the villages. In the next S.P.C.K. Report, we read 'If we wish to establish the Gospel in India, we ought to look beyond the casualties of war, or the revolutions of empire; we ought in time to give the Natives a Church of their own, independent of our support; we ought to have suffragan bishops in the country, who might ordain deacons and priests, and secure a regular succession of truly Apostolic pastors, even if all communications with the parent Church should be annihilated.'

Shortly after this we read of a few more pastors, also in Lutheran Orders, who were called 'country-priests'. Three more were ordained in 1818, four years after there was a bishop in India, a notable circumstance in S.P.C.K. history.

The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel was formed in the year 1701 primarily for work in the colonies but we read that when it was eight years old, it showed its sympathy with the S.P.C.K. work by a gift of £20 from some of its members; a gift memorable as the first English contribution to the evangelization of India. In the next century the Indian Mission was supported in England only by the S.P.C.K. but in 1824 the Mission was transferred to the S.P.G. and the S.P.C.K. practically ceased to send missionaries, but continued the work of publication, endowment of bishoprics and colleges, grants of scholarships to students and help towards Church buildings. For some time the chaplain of the station at Palamcottah supervised the Mission work until in 1828 the first missionary was sent by the S.P.G. to take over the work that had been established by the S.P.C.K.

In the year 1799 the Church Missionary Society was formed. It may be asked why a new society was needed within the same Church, but it must be remembered that missionary zeal took some years to become active, and the S.P.G. had been founded to work amongst colonists who had gone out from England to places where they had no Church and no pastor.

There were now three societies in England directing missionary endeavour in the Church of England and it was natural that they should represent different schools of thought which existed within the Church. As a result of the entrance of the C.M.S. into Tinnevely, Rhenius was appointed in 1820 and in 1835 a grave crisis occurred. Three or four years before this, Rhenius proposed that he and the other Germans with him should ordain, according to the Lutheran use, four or five of the chief Catechists and make them country-priests like those of the S.P.C.K. Mission. To this proposal the C.M.S. replied that the S.P.C.K. country-priests had received Lutheran Orders at a time when there was no English Bishop in India, but that as English Orders were now procurable, a Church society could seek no other for new candidates, though it gladly still recognized Rhenius' own Orders just as the S.P.G. still recognized Kohlhoff's. About this time an arrangement was made by which definite spheres of work were allotted to the two societies. In 1841 the work had grown so much that the question of a bishopric for Tinnevely was mooted, but it was not until 1877 that anything was done and then two assistant bishops were selected, Bishop Sargent for one sphere, Dr. Caldwell for the other. On the death of Bishop Sargent in 1889, Bishop Caldwell became sole Assistant Bishop until 1891. We may note the comparative figures for the years 1835 and 1885 during which Bishop Sargent worked in Tinnevely. In the former year there were 224 villages occupied: in the latter 1,008. In the former year there were 8,693 Christian adherents: in the latter 56,287. As against 114 Communicants, the later record is 11,246: for one

Indian clergyman 68 could be recorded. At the beginning there were no contributions from the Christians, in 1889 they amounted to Rs. 38,057.

Bishop Morley was appointed as the first Diocesan Bishop in Tinnevely in 1896, and was followed by Bishop Williams, Bishop Waller, now Bishop of Madras, Bishop Tubbs, now Bishop of Rangoon, and the present Bishop who was consecrated in 1929 in Madras Cathedral.

During the time of Bishop Williams, the Synod of Bishops directed the bishops to form Diocesan Councils. In the Diocese of Tinnevely up to that time the organization of the work had been directed very largely by two Mission Councils, the C.M.S. and the S.P.G., and although there was quite a friendly relationship between the two, the Mission interest controlled, very largely by support from England, was predominant. Bishop Williams, a pioneer of union, constantly worked to bring the members of the two societies together, and succeeded in part when a common Prayer Book was adopted in Tamil, in place of the two translations that had been previously used. In response to the above request he called together representatives of the whole diocese who met in council but had no executive functions. During the time of Bishop Waller the idea of forming a definite Church organization was considered, and this resulted in the drawing together of the mission work into a Church life and organization which reached its consummation in the first year of the incumbency of Bishop Tubbs, when the Constitution of the Diocese of Tinnevely was duly passed. Unfortunately, as in the time of Rhenius, there were difficulties; but these are gradually disappearing and it is hoped that the Church in Tinnevely will continue to maintain its tradition of life and power.

From the year 1930 the Church in India ceased to be a part of the Church of England, although retaining communion with that body, and the Diocese of Tinnevely is part of the Province of India, Burma and Ceylon, which has a General Council consisting of Bishops, Priests and laymen, governed by a Constitution with Canons and Rules, to direct its business and give guidance for the well-being of the Church.

Organization.—Bishop Sargent had a genius for organization and the inception of Councils within the diocese is very largely due to him, although at such an early period of the life of the Mission, it was natural that he should retain a great deal of the executive power. Similar councils were formed by Bishop Caldwell and the work of each Mission was divided into groups: each group being composed of a number of pastorates and theoretically each pastorate was in charge of a pastor. Committees were arranged within pastorates and groups with two councils to co-ordinate the work.

It is difficult to discover the development of the Council life and to know how far it was regulated by the Mission committees which were held

in Madras, but all the various systems were considered and amalgamated in the Constitution which was passed in 1925.

In that Constitution, each pastorate, of which there are 110, has a committee of which the pastor is Chairman, and it may elect a layman as its Treasurer and Secretary. Each congregation may send by election one or more members to this committee and meetings are regularly held and the proceedings reported to the Circle Committee. A group of pastorates forms a circle, of which there are thirty within the diocese, and one of the pastors of the circle is the Chairman. His circle may elect its own Lay-treasurer and Secretary; representatives from the laymen and Church workers are elected, from the Pastorate Committees, to ensure that at least two-thirds of the members are congregational representatives. The Circle Committee receives all the contributions of the people and decides how the money may be spent. It also has the charge of the elementary education within its area and transfers the Church workers. It discusses matters concerning the spiritual good of the Church within its area and its proceedings are reviewed by a Council. A large number of circles receive no grant from Central Funds and the contributions of the people average about Rs. 1-6-0 per baptized member.

There are three Councils in the Diocese, and each Circle Committee may send representatives by election to the Council within its area. These Councils are not executive but can make recommendations and perform useful functions in the co-ordination of the work of the circles.

The organization of the Diocese is with the Diocesan Council which consists of the bishop, all the clergy of the diocese, and laymen elected directly from each congregation. It has about 250 members of whom 150 are laymen. This large body has very great powers; in the event of a vacancy, it can elect its bishop: on questions of Faith or Order concerning the whole Church it is asked to state its views to the General Council and no Canon of the Church may be altered until the Diocesan Council has discussed the matter and placed its views before the General Council: it will be consulted by the General Council on the question of Union in South India and at its meetings it discusses matters of general concern to the diocese and the good of the Church as a whole. The Council has an Executive Committee of fifty members and to this body is committed financial responsibility and each year it draws up a budget of all the available income (excluding that received within the circles and institutions) and allots the money in accordance with the needs of the diocese. It is interesting to note that of the fifty members, only six are European.

The Executive Committee appoints Standing Committees for Education, Pastoral work, Evangelistic work, Women's work, Children's work, Literature, Scholarship and Co-operative work. These Standing

Committees meet constantly during the year and consider problems connected with the work for which they are appointed. The Pastoral Work Committee recommends to the Bishop the transfer of clergy and selects candidates for the ordination class. It is true that the Bishop need not accept the recommendation of transfer but in the five years of the constitution he has only exercised the veto on two or three occasions when it was realized that a mistake had been made and somebody had to put it right.

In this Council system we have secured the co-operation of the laymen who are in the majority on all Committees. The Councils work well and although at the time of election a great deal of feeling is aroused, and sometimes electioneering methods adopted, yet it is a sign of progress and better than dull apathy.

Institutions.—In the early history of the Tinnevely Mission, the missionaries worked almost entirely in villages so that education in the south started with the village school, in contrast to that in the north where many colleges were erected. The education of girls was considered of equal importance with that of boys although the ordinary villager could not understand it and when a man at Idaiyangudi heard that Mrs. Caldwell was starting a school for girls, he quaintly remarked 'they will be teaching the cows next'. The statistics of education as between boys and girls would tend to show that many people still regard girls as unsuited for education. As a result of the establishment of village education, a large proportion of the village schools in Tinnevely are managed by the diocese and there is a desire at present to establish Higher Elementary schools in every circle. There are eight High Schools for boys and two of these have recently been opened as a result of local effort. There are two High schools and a second-grade College for girls, also a second-grade College for boys and a first-grade College at Trichinopoly which was amalgamated with the college at Tuticorin: Normal Training Schools for boys and girls and a Theological Seminary which trains candidates for the ministry; graduates being provided for at Bishop's College, Calcutta. Several attempts have been made in the direction of industrial work. There was for many years a Printing Press at Ramnad established after the famine to provide for orphan boys but it was not possible to purchase up-to-date machinery and this was finally closed down. Another Industrial school, established in the time of the famine, is still working at Nazareth and the articles produced here find immediate sale in all parts of the Presidency, and many of the lads are able to secure very good positions as a result of their training. Mrs. Caldwell founded a Lace Industry at Idaiyangudi but recently this has been closed as there is no outlet for the lace produced and it is difficult to maintain it as a village industry. Embroidery work is still done at Mengnanapuram.

Two outstanding institutions in the diocese, founded by devoted

women, are the schools for the Blind and that for the Deaf and Dumb, and mention also must be made of the excellent work done under the direction of Miss Carmichael at Dohnavur.

There are seven hospitals and dispensaries in charge of Medical Evangelists which relieve a great deal of suffering and are the means of direct evangelistic work. The hospital at Mengnanapuram is managed by the Circle Committee who provide the funds necessary for its maintenance.

The Future.—This article started with the work of the Church of England and at the end of the period records the beginning of the Church of India.

The missionaries gave to India the Truth that was in them but hoped that the genius of India would discover the vision of Christ that would appeal to the people of the country.

The foundation and the superstructure of the building have been provided, but the Church of India is to realize the spirit of the home.

In a vision one may see a united Church in the land in which the work of the past has been fused with the spirit of the present, so that India may become, by the Divine Providence of God, one of the brightest jewels in the crown that will adorn the head of the Saviour Who died to save all the people of the whole world.

Bibliography

Records of the early History of the Tinnevely Mission—Bishop Caldwell.

Two Hundred Years of the S.P.G.—C. F. Pascoe.

History of the C.M.S.—Eugene Stock.

Centenary History of the C.M.S. in Tinnevely—Paul Appasamy.

Constitution of the Diocese of Tinnevely.

Constitution, Canons and Rules of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon.

Correspondence

To the Editor,

December 30, 1930.

Church Union News and Views,

c/o Dr. J. J. Banninga,

South India United Church,

PASUMALAI, South India.

Dear Mr. Editor,

May I be permitted to try to modify an impression left by a few expressions used by my friend Mr. J. V. Chelliah in his article on the Bournemouth Conference, expressions which, without his intention, might be slightly misleading or open to objection from those who differ from him?

I know that he will only desire as I do myself, that any cause for misunderstanding should be eliminated.

He says, 'Before I started I was told plainly that I was to present the subject of the Church Union Scheme of South India to the Council'. This might be read as meaning that Mr. Chelliah was invited by the International Council of Congregational Churches to present this subject, which was not the case. The Council simply desired to have the advantage of a contribution to its programme by representatives of the growing churches in China and India and therefore allotted subjects to Dr. Cheng Ching Yi and Mr. Chelliah. It was Mr. Chelliah's friends in India or Ceylon who asked him to present the Church Union Scheme to the Council. Unfortunately Mr. Chelliah did not observe the subject allotted to him in the programme and therefore raised no objection until he reached Bournemouth. International Councils cannot lightly change their programme, so that inevitably there was at first some reluctance on the part of the Committee to make a change, but as Mr. Chelliah has indicated, a change was made to meet his wishes and it should be acknowledged that this was an act of extreme courtesy, the whole programme being altered for this purpose.

I think further, Mr. Chelliah when recalling to mind some of the distinguished persons who showed distrust of the Scheme, would like to modify the sweeping nature of his sentence to the effect that 'any distrust of the Scheme that was shown was the outcome, not of a study of the Scheme, but of ignorance of it.' In fairness it must obviously be admitted that there are not a few careful students of the Scheme who show distrust of it. I am sure that this is the real opinion of Mr. Chelliah.

The making of these modifications would, I feel, not weaken but strengthen Mr. Chelliah's able advocacy of the Scheme of Union and would remove some slight cause for soreness amongst the friends who met him at Bournemouth.

Yours faithfully,
(Signed) G. E. PHILLIPS.

The Editor, *Church Union*.

Sir,

I am glad to have the opportunity of making my comment on the letter appearing in this number from Mr. Phillips making certain observations on my article on the Bournemouth Conference. I am very sorry that I should have given any cause for soreness to any friends whom I met at Bournemouth. When the suggestion was made that I should go to the Conference, I was asked by Dr. Banninga to present the case for the South Indian Scheme. Naturally I concluded that the arrangement had been made with those who had charge of the programme.

Mr. Phillips assures us that the mistake was not that of the organizers. I am not at all anxious to fasten the blame on anybody. In the face of the statement of Mr. Phillips I have to withdraw my words: 'Somebody at Bournemouth seems to have blundered'.

Mr. Phillips seems to imply that I neglected to notice the subject allotted to me. There was no neglect on my part; I was touring in America, and so letters did not reach me in time, and when the programme reached me, it was too late to get it changed, and I thought it best to arrange matters personally.

My statement was that the distrust of the Scheme was due to the lack of a careful study of it by the *leaders I met*. I quite accept the contention of Mr. Phillips that according to *his* experience 'there are not a few careful students of the Scheme who show distrust of it'.

I wish to close with a personal note. I wish to express my great appreciation of the unfailing courtesy and kindness with which I was treated by all the leaders assembled at Bournemouth.

Yours sincerely,
J. C. CHELLIAH.

JAFFNA COLLEGE,
CEYLON,
February 19, 1931.

Clippings

Christian Fellowship in 1930 at Home

BY THE REV. PRINCIPAL A. E. GARVIE, D.D.

(From *The British Weekly*)

While in the Apostolic Benediction the three divine boons which the believer possesses are stated in co-ordinated clauses, yet in reality they are not only closely interrelated, but are essentially one as constituting God's redeeming and reconciling revelation to man. The eternal reality of the love of God, God as Father, is revealed in the historical actuality of the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, God as Saviour; and that revelation is realized in personal experience in the *common possession* by all believers of the Holy Spirit, God as Life-Giver. If a philosophical distinction may be pardoned for the sake of making the meaning clearer in fewer words, this is the *objective order*. The *subjective order* is the reverse. It is, as Jesus is reported in the Fourth Gospel to have taught, by the operation of the Spirit in man that His grace is realized, and it is in His grace that the Father is revealed. This Apostolic Benediction, if adequately interpreted, is all the creed the Christian Church needs. The revelation of the divine reality with fulness of blessing for man is completed in the *communion* of the Holy Spirit, and that communion is a condition of

realizing that revelation in experience. How vital must this communion be!

The word *Koinonia*, however, like a jewel, presents many flashing facets. I do not think our English word *communion* is adequate, as our too dominating religious individualism tends to interpret the word as an individual intercourse of man with God. I have above rendered it by the phrase *common possession* to correct this error. But that even does not exhaust the significance of the word. In French it has been translated *communication*, in German *Theilnahme*, or *Antheilnahme*, participation. All believers *participate* as in a *common possession* in whatever blessing the Holy Spirit *communicates*. Because they share one life, they become a *community*; a common experience, interest, motive, purpose, suffering and action are theirs. In Paul's analogy they are one body, the members of which suffer or rejoice together. Dr. Anderson Scott, in his contribution on *Pentecost* to the volume of *Essays on The Spirit*, lays stress on *fellowship*, as shown in the breaking of bread as with *power*—the primary result of the outpouring of the Spirit.

There is no subject nearer the heart of the Christian religion than this of *fellowship*—the unity of all believers in God through the community of His Spirit; and the saddest tragedy of the history of the Christian Church is that that fellowship has been broken by divisions; and that to-day, when Christians all over the world are being moved by the Spirit of God to seek and strive for the recovery of that fellowship in Him, it is still made impossible by theories of ministry and sacraments for them all to realize themselves and make manifest to the world this fellowship at the Table of the Lord.

I have dwelt so long on this divine basis of *fellowship* for three reasons: (1) The claim of the community in the Spirit has not in the thought and the life of Christians to-day the august authority or the imperative urgency that such a basis demands; and Christians acquiesce in, and are content with, the existence of divisions which break that fellowship. (2) The disappointment which many Non-conformists feel regarding the report of the Lambeth Conference is tempting not a few to regard the reunion movement not only as 'a forlorn hope,' but even as 'a will o' the wisp' and they are becoming faint-hearted and weary of well-doing in this regard. (3) If the Churches for the first or the second reason become indifferent and abandon effort they will expose themselves deservedly to the world's reproach. In every sphere—racial, international, political, social, economic—men are recognizing the danger of division and the duty of fellowship. If such interests are drawing men together for mutual understanding and co-operation, how much more should the common possession of the Spirit, and all that that divine gift makes possible for man, make Christians confident, patient, courageous, persistent in the endeavour to make manifest the unity of Christ's body.

As we look back upon the past year we need not falter or fail in this enterprise. As one who is in close, constant contact with the international movements of the Christian Churches, let me assure my despondent brethren that the movement towards fellowship is world-wide; and, despite Papal Encyclicals directed against such movements, even in Roman Catholicism there are aspirations for fellowship with other Christians. Let one illustration suffice. Last year there was published a collection of essays on Luther from the *acumenical standpoint*. Some of the contributors were Roman Catholics, who sought to do justice to one whom their Church condemned as a heretic. The efforts of the Lambeth Conference to come to an understanding with the Orthodox Oriental Churches have disappointed some Non-conformists, and have excited even the resentment of a few; but anyone who knows the situation in South-Eastern Europe and the conditions in these Churches cannot but rejoice if by more intimate relation to the Church of England their spiritual vitality and moral vigour can be stimulated for the common good

of Christendom. I must confess my own disappointment at the report of the Lambeth Conference when I first read it; but further reflection has convinced me that there is no just ground for resentment. In view, on the one hand, of the world-wide object the 1920 appeal set forth, nothing less than the reunion of Christendom, and, on the other hand, of the conflicting theological and ecclesiastical currents in the Conference itself, it is not surprising, although regrettable, that the high tide of mutual understanding reached in the informal conversations at Lambeth should have receded in the formal decisions. I am myself convinced that the will to fellowship in the leaders of the Church of England remains, and should be met by a will to fellowship among the Free Churches.

Although I do not at all share the views on ministry and sacraments which hinder *full fellowship* at the Lord's Table, yet as these views are historically explicable, and the hindrance to this full fellowship is a logical consequence of these views, my attitude is one of regret, but not resentment. If full fellowship is not yet practical, let there be as much fellowship as is possible. No *amour propre* demands refusal to preach, when invited, in Anglican churches or cathedrals; but Christian love constrains to welcome every opportunity of rendering any desired service to Christian brethren. One may dare to believe and hope that this set-back, if such it be, to official conversations will not retard the advance in personal relations between Anglicans and Non-conformists in the common work of the Kingdom of God.

Among Non-conformists the desire for fellowship grows, if slowly. There is increasing co-operation in local effort. The exchange of denominational courtesies, as of the visit of the Moderator of the English Presbyterian Church to the Congregational Assembly, becomes more frequent. Committees to prevent overlapping in the new areas of municipal housing are being formed all over the country. There has been informal talk about closer relations of Congregationalists and Presbyterians. A joint committee for consultation and co-operation between Baptists has just been formed. The Federal Council, in its proposals regarding home evangelisation, has been bringing the denominations into closer relations in regard to their most vital interests. Dr. Brown, the Moderator, made a moving plea for the recapture of the vision of a United Free Church of England, and a committee is exploring this possibility. These are all small beginnings, but if we believe, as did that saint and seer of reunion, Bishop Brent, that God wills unity, dare we be disobedient to that heavenly vision? As one for whom the essential unity of the Church of Christ, despite its historical divisions, is rooted in the unity of God Himself, every failure in fellowship is a sorrow to me and every gain in fellowship a joy in the Lord, in which I find strength to labour on, spend and be spent in this to do the Master's will.